	Case 2:21-cv-02219-ER	Filed 11/29/21 Page 1 of 29	
1	UNITED STATE	S DISTRICT COURT	
2			
	EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA		
3	JONATHAN R. MILLER,	Case No. 2:21-cv-02219-ER	
4	Plaintiff,		
5	V.	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania November 10, 2021	
6	BREM MOLDOVSKY, et al,	10:01 a.m.	
7	Defendants.		
8	TDANGCDIDT (	NE MORION HEADING	
9	TRANSCRIPT OF MOTION HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE EDUARDO C. ROBRENO		
10		DISTRICT COURT JUDGE	
11	APPEARANCES: For the Plaintiff:	onathan R. Miller, Esq.	
12		100 Overlook Center, 2nd Floor Princeton, NJ 08540	
13		Brem Moldovsky, Esq.	
14		Brem Moldovsky, LLC 100 N. 18th Street	
15		Suite 300 Philadelphia, PA 19103	
16		Gerald J. Pomerantz, Esq.	
17		erald Jay Pomerantz & Associates 500 John F Kennedy Blvd	
18		2 Penn Center, Suite 1320 Philadelphia, PA 19102	
19	Court Recorder:	Inna Goldshetyn	
20	Clerk:	Ronald Vance	
21	Transcription Service:	Chris Hwang Abba Reporting	
22		PO Box 223282	
23		Chantilly, Virginia 20153	
24	Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript produced by transcription service.		
25			

	Case 2:21-cv-02219-ER Document 73 Filed 1	11/29/21 Page 2 of 29
1		۷
1	INDEX	
2		<u>Page</u>
3	Court's Ruling	27
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

(Call to order at 10:01 a.m.)

THE CLERK: All rise. United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania is now in session, the Honorable Eduardo C. Robreno presiding.

THE COURT: Good morning, please be seated.

ATTORNEYS (IN UNISON): Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yeah. Okay, and you may remove your mask when speaking to the Court. Okay, so we have scheduled here three discovery motions. Since then, a number of other motions have been filed.

And we can also take this opportunity to visit with the overall status of the case and a path forward.

So, Mr. Miller, what's the status of the case?

MR. MILLER: The status of the case is that as set out in my various motions, and I guess one or two more to be filed that the Defendants, particularly Mr. Moldovsky and his law firm are stonewalling discovery except for the half redacted 27 pages they've produced, that I've submitted to the Court in connection with a Motion For Relief To Reply that relates to Mr. Stretton's -- the Motion to Compel Mr. Stretton.

And Mr. Moldovsky has produced no other documents and has avoided all of my interrogatories that set out in the various motions that I'm happy to argue as that may be.

On my part, I just now received this morning a few minutes ago Mr. Pomerantz's responses to certain

interrogatories.

I glanced at them. I don't want to render an opinion, but I think that -- well, I don't want to render an opinion. I'd like to review it further. I don't want to express any opinion about Mr. Pomerantz or his participation of, you know, in discovery.

With respect to myself, we've produced many documents. I think we're approaching 10,000 pages of documents.

Most of those documents were already in the possession of Mr. Moldovsky. To my knowledge, they may not have been in the possession of Mr. Pomerantz. Nonetheless, I produced them.

THE COURT: Now, Mr. Conrad is whom?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Pomerantz.

THE COURT: Oh, Mr. Pomerantz, okay.

MR. MILLER: Did I misspeak? I apologize.

THE COURT: Oh, no, I misunderstood what you say, yeah. I had not heard that name before, so.

MR. MILLER: Yeah. And my understanding from Mr. Moldovsky's Motion to Compel, which he just recently filed and I have to file an opposition I guess by Monday, is that it was improper for me to give him documents that he already has.

There are certain documents that he did not previously have. It's a well-settled principle of law that I

can not be compelled to produce documents that don't exist.

I've made certain objections. I believe those objections are well founded, but the overall -- I think there's an overall disparity in terms of engaging in good faith with discovery obligations between the two sides.

We have a number of depositions scheduled or yet to be scheduled. Mr. Stretton's deposition, he's probably the primary fact witness in this matter.

I noticed that quite some time ago for Monday, which I think is the 15th. Just a couple minutes ago, I got an email from Mr. Moldovsky, you know, saying I can't hand it in. I just looked at it on my cell phone basically announcing that he's blocking Mr. Stretton from appearing at the deposition on Monday. He objects for, I'm not sure what reasons, but he's, you know he's blocking Mr. Stretton.

I view that as highly improper because Mr. Stretton was subpoenaed and is a fact witness. Whatever role he may play as an expert witness, you know, that's yet to be visited, but for my purposes, the deposition on Monday was said to be -- is set to be a deposition of a fact witness.

It's also set to be in person at Mr. Stretton's office, you know, with appropriate Covid precautions, I believe that --

Well, Mr. Moldovsky hasn't indicated, but I believe everyone else is fully vaccinated. So, I don't know the reason

1 why the deposition cannot proceed in person. Mr. Moldovsky has 2 objected. 3 THE COURT: Well, okay. Okay, so. 4 MR. MILLER: Sir, may I? 5 THE COURT: Massive confusion. 6 MR. MILLER: Yeah, we've noticed --THE COURT: That's really the bottom line. 8 Mr. Moldovsky, what's your view of the status of the 9 matter? 10 MR. MOLDOVKY: Thank you, Your Honor. A number of 11 things. First replying to what Mr. Miller said, we've turned 12 over everything requested and really more than what needs to 13 be, what should be. 14 Regarding Mr. Miller's turnover for a moment, it's 15 highly deficient. He literally just gave us an endless pile of 16 papers that we already have, which is supposed to look like, 17 oh, I've turned over 10,000 pages, but we all have it already. 18 He's turned over literally nothing of what we're 19 seeking. 20 THE COURT: Uh-huh. 21 MR. MILLER: And Your Honor didn't ask us about each 22 motion to argue each motion. 23 THE COURT: No, we're not talking about that. No. 24 MR. MOLDOVKY: Right, so just the matter I would say, 25 and to really address that, I would say this is a matter, Your

Honor, that I truly think that a mutual observer would say this matter should settle. It's not a good thing for the people involved. It doesn't forward their lives. It doesn't help the court system.

And we've worked very hard to try to do that and got into a place where people are willing to walk away, but then, Miller was seeking to silence us. And I can't silence myself about my life.

So, when you asked what's the status, that's the status. And as far as status, literally, we get correspondence almost every day.

Mr. Miller is using this as an opportunity, like it's been for the last three and half years, to utterly bombard us, whether it's Mr. Stretton, Mr. Pomerantz, attorneys — other attorneys who've seen this. People have not seen this before. We have hundreds of years of attorneys with experience with law and have not seen this.

This is what Mr. Miller does. It is nonstop -we -- bombarding us. We barely can function, barely can live
our lives.

Our paralegal, Mr. Pom -- we can all explain what's happening. And it's basically inane issues like 10,000 documents that we already have. I don't need what I already have.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

1 MR. MOLDOVKY: So, I can go further, but to give you 2 a big picture answer --3 THE COURT: Uh-huh. 4 MR. MOLDOVKY: -- that's the big picture answer. And 5 we're doing our best. We're following everything. We're 6 responding to everything. We asked discovery questions. We've 7 aot --8 THE COURT: Well, let me ask you a question since 9 we're talking about the general status of the matter. 10 MR. MOLDOVKY: Yeah. 11 THE COURT: I appreciate your counterclaim has been 12 narrowed significantly, but it doesn't appear to have much of a 13 connection to the main claim. It appears to be a collection of 14 other incidents and experiences that you had with Mr. Miller in 15 separate occasions. 16 The Bucks County seems to me is a fairly 17 straightforward, factual case. The counterclaim raises a 18 number of other issues. 19 How are they connected? I know they're not connected 20 to the extent that they are not compulsory, but how do we 21 benefit by trying these cases together? 2.2 MR. MILLER: I would say and I thought about that --23 THE COURT: Yeah. 24 MR. MILLER: -- and I'm happy to address that. I 25 would say a main connection point between Mr. Miller's claims

and my counterclaims is very simple.

And basically, Mr. Miller's claims are saying that during the litigation with -- between my law firm and Mr. Ellner and Lightbox, where Mr. Miller was involved, that during that, they say that my Bucks County action was like a collateral attack, it was a side attack, it was -- and so while that dispute's going on, I did this whole collateral attack to try to gain leverage in that case.

Well, all the things they did were also a collateral attack to try to gain leverage. I'd say to -- that most simply, Your Honor, is the most direct connection.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. MOLDOVKY: I can go on, but that simply put is the most direct connection, that there were -- that both sides were alleging that these activities were collateral attack and an attack meant to impact the fee dispute in the dispute.

THE COURT: That's the basis of your counterclaim then? The theory of your counterclaim is that?

MR. MOLDOVKY: No, I would say that's the connection point.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MOLDOVKY: The theories are -- the theory is very simple. Basically, they sought without basis and it's already been found by the courts in New York to have no basis.

They did this massive attack. And, again, I get

noticed in the middle of the night that goes on. Aside from the filings, there's an endless amount of letters.

And it was a vast attack on me that they then got a TRO for a year. And then, that was denied when a permanent -- or dissolved the permanent injunction was denied.

So, the idea is it was a whole basis injunction that has no basis, the courts found that had no basis. But then they had three sanction motions that in large part were looking to punish me based on violations of that.

And, again, it was all unfounded. And it was all very vicious and took a tremendous amount of time.

Additionally, we're also alleging that this very action is an abuse of process.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. MILLER: We're not, you know, currently alleging malicious prosecution, but an abuse of process that doesn't need termination to be alleged.

And why is this an abuse of process? Because Mr.

Miller has made it very clear again and again that his purpose here is really seeking to silence me and to silence me about public record information.

And he'd walk away from all of this if I would just be silent, if I just wouldn't talk about his misconduct.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. MOLDOVKY: And that's not -- he can't get that

relief here. He hasn't alleged it. It's already been denied by the Appellate Division, the New York trial court, the New Jersey trial court. He abandoned his action there. So, he can't possibly get this relief.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. MOLDOVKY: But he's pounding on me to give him this relief.

THE COURT: See --

MR. MOLDOVKY: And that's part of it, too.

THE COURT: -- one dynamic that is missing in this case, which is ordinarily present in civil litigation and which has the effect of limiting the parties' desires in -- to see what legal relief can be obtained is that you're both lawyers. And it doesn't cost you any money to trade insults and wild theories to each other.

You can do that in your spare time. Instead of watching Sunday night football, you can write briefs and motions and tell each other what it is.

You're insulated from defamation by the fact that they're court pleadings. You're insulated economically, because you don't have to hire a lawyer.

And you just simply dump everything on the Court and says to the Court you figure it out while we play.

MR. MOLDOVKY: Your Honor --

THE COURT: You know, and you've done that now

through three states, several courts. And you've ended up here. And it's just not reasonable to simply dump all of this on the Court.

MR. MOLDOVKY: Your Honor, I --

THE COURT: I think what's appropriate here is to appoint a Special Master. And a Special Master will sit down with you as long as is necessary, of course at a fee, but as long as is necessary and parse all this out and see who is entitled to what documents.

We -- the public interest can not sustained this barrage. And not only I speak for this Court, I think I speak for the Court in Bucks County, in the state of New Jersey, in the state of New York. This is a travelling circus.

MR. MOLDOVKY: Your Honor --

THE COURT: Okay, okay, hold on a minute.

MR. MOLDOVKY: -- basically everything --

THE COURT: Hold on a minute.

MR. MOLDOVKY: I'm sorry.

THE COURT: And we -- you know, I just can't administer the docket of this Court with -- and I'm not saying that this doesn't have any merit. I mean, there may be merit to some of these claims.

But what I'm saying is the manner in which this litigation is being conducted is really inconsistent with the Rules. It's inconsistent with professionalism.

It does not give anybody related to this litigation, you know, much credit for understanding, you know, the Rules or applying the Rules.

And it's highly personal, which is another problem when you don't have a lawyer because the litigants may have personal animus and other motives, but there's a lawyer there whispering on the ear of the litigant, you know, this doesn't make sense. You know, we shouldn't do this and that.

You don't have that limit here. This is a free for all. It's like wrestling on television. You're just trying to do each other. And it's not going to be done.

There's a number of things that can be done. One could be to sever those cases and make them two different cases.

As I said, we should send this to a Special Master, who will try to figure out the litigation, and if the parties are interested, settle the case.

If they're not interested and you both want to continue to battle this, well, you have a referee. And the referee will be the Special Master.

So, we're not -- I mean, I reviewed the motions that are up for today, most of which really with a phone call could have been resolved.

It's just difficult to understand. So, what's your explanation as to how we resolve this matter?

1 MR. MOLDOVKY: First, I just want to say, Your Honor, 2 maybe except for a word here or there, everything you just 3 said --4 THE COURT: Yeah. 5 MR. MOLDOVKY: -- makes so much sense and it's very 6 much in line with what we're trying. 7 THE COURT: Uh-huh. 8 MR. MOLDOVKY: I will point out that's why I 9 originally got another lawyer involved. The problem is anybody 10 I get involved, he targets. 11 THE COURT: Uh-huh. MR. MOLDOVKY: So, I got a lawyer involved and he 12 13 sued him. I have another lawyer involved, so the name Steffan 14 Malcoff, (phonetic), who had entered on one of the other cases, 15 who had come to some of the hearings. 16 He was intending to enter here and is intending to 17 enter here. He actually started off his practice in PA. He's 18 now up in (indiscernible), it's okay. We realize he 19 wasn't -- he never entered here. 20 So, literally, about two months ago, he went to the 21 paperwork to enter here. We're just waiting for him 22 to -- we're just waiting for him to get entered here. He's 23 just waiting for the paperwork.

He already sent in, I believe, it's about two months ago. It's -- once he gets it, he was going to enter so Your

24

25

1 Honor should have some comfort that Steffan Malcolf has been 2 advising and trying to help me. 3 Again, I got Mr. Pomerantz in. And I'm actually 4 pretty well known as a place who seeks out counsel all the 5 time. I sought out Mr. Miller's counsel. He used to help me 6 with things. So, I would say your --7 8 THE COURT: Well, Mr. Pomerantz is a party here as 9 well so --10 MR. MOLDOVKY: Right, I got involved --11 THE COURT: -- he can't be a lawyer and a party. I 12 mean, that's really the problem. 13 MR. MOLDOVKY: Right. 14 THE COURT: He's your father-in-law, so that's a 15 second consideration, a family consideration, that is involved 16 here. 17 We don't have the judgment, professional judgment, of 18 nonlitigants that can advise both of you that enough is enough. 19 MR. MOLDOVKY: Well, Your Honor, we'll just say to be 20 very fair --21 THE COURT: Yeah. 22 MR. MOLDOVKY: -- I've said I've been trying to just 23 get a walkaway. And I've been on the Defense on this. This is 24 Mr. Miller's case.

THE COURT: Yeah.

25

1 MR. MOLDOVKY: I wish I didn't have to be involved. I would do anything just to move on with my life. 2 3 THE COURT: Yeah. 4 MR. MOLDOVKY: It's -- to be very honest, Your Honor 5 6 THE COURT: Yeah. 7 MR. MOLDOVKY: -- it's me who's being pursued. You 8 saw I resolved with Mr. Ellner. I walked away from a half a 9 million dollars in fees. I did everything I could to be 10 resolved. 11 And, again, Mr. Malcoff has been advising me. But 12 again, Mr. Pomerantz initially wasn't sued and he was the other 13 attorney I got involved. 14 THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Miller? 15 MR. MOLDOVKY: Also, Your Honor, one more thing I 16 would just say --17 THE COURT: Yes. 18 MR. MOLDOVKY: -- I think both parties have made 19 noises that welcoming a magistrate or somebody, some neutral 20 person is very much welcome. 21 THE COURT: Okay. 22 Thank you, Your Honor. I think the appointment of a magistrate and Special Master --23 24 THE COURT: No, I said a Special Master. It's not 25 going to be a magistrate.

MR. MILLER: Okay, a Special Master's also a good resolution with the one comment that I think there's a disparity in each side settle -- I'm sorry, discovery compliance.

And I don't think the Special Master's fee should be split automatically down the middle. I think there should do some accounting for which side's being reasonable.

THE COURT: Well, the Special Master would recommend how the fee should be paid.

MR. MILLER: That's fine. Thank you, Your Honor.

And with respect to settlement after it -- as I think is in my papers, for what it's worth, it was the -- just before Yom Kippur, which for Jews is a great opportunity to ask forgiveness of fellow people, you know, Jews and non-Jews.

Mr. Moldovsky asked me he wanted to settle for zero dollars and he asked me to provide terms to settle for zero dollars.

And I gave him those terms. And part of those terms would be basically the Court willing to have a confidentiality, nondisparagement provision. And his response was to demand -- to reject that and to demand \$500,000.

Just before entering this Court, I exchanged a couple of words, pleasant words, with Mr. Pomerantz. And he expressed his view that this case should have been settled long, long ago. And he would try his best and he's tried his best. He's,

1 you know, to use his statement, to resolve this matter. 2 I reached out to Mr. Stretton in terms of 3 coordinating his --4 THE COURT: You --5 MR. MILLER: Mr. Stretton also in terms of --6 THE COURT: Yeah, okay, but he's also involved in the 7 case. 8 MR. MILLER: Yes, and he also volunteered. 9 THE COURT: Yeah. 10 MR. MILLER: I was coordinate -- I was trying to 11 coordinate dates for a deposition I think or compliance with 12 discovery. I don't remember. 13 He said on his own volition that this case should 14 have been settled. And he'd be happy to broker -- I don't know 15 that he can. I think whatever broker settlement that he'd be 16 happy to broker a settlement. 17 This thing is a train that's gone off the rails for 18 three years now. I don't understand what --19 THE COURT: No, you both have -- let me just 20 interrupt you to say you both have practices. You have 21 clients. I'm sure that's been affected. 2.2 You have families and been in litigation, as you 23 know, been a party in the litigation. It's just burdensome. 24 MR. MILLER: It --25 THE COURT: It's just sucking up the energy that you

```
1
     ought to be spending somewhere else.
 2
               Aside from that, you know, money is fungible, but
 3
     life is short.
 4
               MR. MILLER: Totally agree.
 5
               THE COURT: Okay.
 6
               MR. MILLER: For the last three years, I've been
 7
      suffering from these attacks. Mr. Moldovsky's --
 8
               THE COURT: Well, okay.
 9
               MR. MILLER: Mr. Moldovsky said that he's playing
10
     Defense. My words, but --
11
               THE COURT: Yeah.
12
               MR. MILLER: -- basically, that he's on the defense.
13
     He just filed another lawsuit in the District of New Jersey.
14
               THE COURT: Okay.
15
               MR. MILLER: Everything that Your Honor just
16
      (indiscernible) here --
17
                THE COURT: Well, I would think that a settlement
18
     here needs to be global --
19
               MR. MILLER: Absolutely.
20
               THE COURT: -- and finished. And you're done with
21
     each other.
22
               And I think what we will do, and I have a candidate
23
     in mind, which is a former magistrate Judge Thomas Rueter, who
24
     is at JAMS now, but who worked with me for 25 years.
```

And he's the finest human being as well as lawyer

25

that I can recommend because I think this is a case that not only involves legal principles, but I think it involves some humanity in here that needs to be done.

And what I would propose to do is to ask if he's willing to undertake this assignment to ask Judge Rueter to convene a conference first or maybe both together at his judgment that will deal with both the discovery issues and with settlement of the case on a global basis because I think to be able to understand the discovery issues, you have to understand the whole panorama here.

So, he'd be in a position to go both ways or either way. If there's a prospect for settlement and I'm -- some -- I don't think any of you have appeared before me here, but my philosophy is that the parties settle the case.

I don't force anybody to settle the case. I provide opportunities, but if you come back and you say, hey, I paid \$400 to get into court and I want a jury to tell me, Judge, forget you, I want them to tell me that. And if you have a legal claim, then it's up to you.

I think there are cases that just cry out to be settled. This is one of them. But if you don't want to settle, forget it. You know, you can stand on your own rights.

But I think that Judge Rueter can be helpful. You'd also -- you'll get an independent evaluation of what your case is.

That's another problem not having a lawyer that is as you know from your own clients, your own clients have a distorted view of their own -- the merit of their own cases.

They think they have a much stronger case. They don't understand the -- what can happen in Court. They don't understand that there's no sure thing.

They have a lawyer, you know, whispering in their ear. You don't have a lawyer whispering in your ear.

And as capable lawyers as you are, what do they say about a lawyer who represents himself has a fool for a client?

And I don't mean that to be insulting --

MR. MILLER: No.

THE COURT: -- but I mean that to kind of be descriptive of the difficulty, a doctor who tries to cure himself, you know, has a fool for a patient. That's what I'm trying to get at before we, you know, before we face a disaster here.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Your Honor. I appreciate that. Short of, you know, offering a zero dollar settlement and --

THE COURT: Yeah, well --

MR. MILLER: -- in exchange for, you know, a nondisparagement --

THE COURT: I don't know -- well, maybe that's what the case is worth. I have no idea.

1 MR. MILLER: I mean, I can't --2 THE COURT: Yeah. 3 MR. MILLER: -- I'm not going to pay him for my own 4 claim. That's --5 THE COURT: Well, I don't know. That you'll tell 6 Judge Rueter. 7 And as I said, if you don't want to settle, you don't 8 have to settle, but the Court is not going to sort this out for 9 both of you to serve both as a judge and as a psychoanalysis of 10 your problems. That -- this is not the place to do it. 11 So, I think what we'll do is the following. I think I'm going to stay the case. I'm going to ask Judge Rueter to 12 13 convene a conference with you to look at both the discovery of 14 the matter and the settlement of the matter. 15 If he can settle the matter, that's fine. If he can 16 not settle the matter, then to resolve the discovery issues. 17 MR. MILLER: Your Honor, I respectfully request both 18 parties have put forth considerable efforts --19 THE COURT: Yeah. 20 MR. MILLER: -- to brief. I think three different 21 motions are fully briefed at this point. Could those be 22 decided by the Court on submission without oral argument? 23 THE COURT: Which motions? 24 MR. MILLER: There's my Motion to Compel with respect 25 to Mr. Stretton.

THE COURT: No, no, I will decide nothing further at this point --

MR. MILLER: Right.

THE COURT: -- until you have the conference with

Judge Rueter and he sorts out -- the only thing is he will not
decide a Motion to Dismiss. He will not do a merits -- a

dispositive motion.

Those I would decide if they're warranted at an appropriate time, but all pre-trial discovery motions or scheduling motions will go to him and he will sort this out.

The only thing I'd like to hear his -- once he meets with you whether or not if the case is not settled whether or not it should be severed.

And we would do and do Bucks County if that's feasible and get that out of the way. And then, we do the counterclaim, whatever's left of that counterclaim separate.

It may be that his recommendation would be the other way. It's only a recommendation. It's my call under Rule 42, but I got a lot of trust on Judge Rueter and he'll be able to drill down into these motions.

I mean, I have my sense of what they are and -- but I think he'll be able to impart his wisdom and spend the time that is necessary to sort this out.

And in a way, to serve almost as your independent lawyer since you don't have a lawyer. He'll be able to do

```
1
     that. So, that's where I'm going.
 2
                So, any final comments?
 3
               MR. MILLER: I know that this Court has no authority
 4
     over the proceeding in the District Court of New Jersey --
 5
               THE COURT: Yes.
 6
               MR. MILLER: -- but it may be helpful to both parties
 7
     if Your Honor would express some opinion as to --
 8
               THE COURT: Yeah.
 9
               MR. MILLER: -- whether the New Jersey action --
10
               THE COURT: Who's the judge in New Jersey?
11
               MR. MOLDOVKY: Your Honor, it's -- I --
12
               MR. MILLER: Quraishi.
13
               MR. MOLDOVKY: -- I don't remember the name. I think
14
     it's a new judge, but I don't remember the name.
15
               THE COURT: Oh, is it in Camden?
16
               MR. MILLER: No.
17
               MR. MOLDOVKY: It's a federal.
18
               THE COURT: Right.
19
               MR. MOLDOVKY: It's in federal court there. I think
20
     in Trenton.
21
               THE COURT: Oh, in Trenton.
22
               MR. MILLER: It's Judge Quraishi, Q-U -- I'm probably
23
     mispronouncing it.
24
               THE COURT: Oh, yes.
25
               MR. MILLER: It starts with a Z, the first name --
```

```
1
               THE COURT: Yes.
 2
               MR. MILLER: -- but Quraishi.
 3
               THE COURT: Well, she's not a new judge.
 4
               MR. MOLDOVKY: I think it's a he.
 5
               MR. MILLER: He's a new judge appointed in May.
 6
               THE COURT: Oh, then, it's someone different than --
 7
               MR. MILLER: Q-U-R-A-I-S-H-I.
 8
               THE COURT: Okay, well --
 9
               MR. MILLER: Pakistani --
10
                THE COURT: If you think that there is any relation
11
     here -- the two of you are the parties?
12
               MR. MILLER: Yeah.
13
               MR. MOLDOVKY: Yes, Your Honor --
14
               THE COURT: Yeah.
15
               MR. MOLDOVKY: -- and my entity, but I would just ask
16
     if Your Honor hasn't seen it that I don't know that Your Honor
17
     should be --
18
               THE COURT: No, I don't want to get involved.
19
               MR. MOLDOVKY: -- making an opinion.
20
               THE COURT: All I would say is that I would ask you
21
     maybe for you to consider to say to the judge simply we're
22
     engaged in a global settlement. We'd like to get, you know, 90
23
     days or some such a thing.
24
               And then, we'll come back here and do the -- I have
25
     no idea what the case is about, but it seems a waste of
```

1 resources to proceed with no matter what the case is and what 2 the merits are, if you can resolve the whole thing. 3 MR. MOLDOVKY: No, no, I --4 THE COURT: Was just simply that. And if you would 5 like me to, both you agree, then I will contact the judge and ask him and say, look, there is a -- the potential for a global 6 7 settlement. 8 Would you agree to grant the parties some period of 9 time to do that? And if they can not, they'll come back here. 10 No prejudice. 11 MR. MOLDOVKY: There's no objection from me to that whatsoever, Your Honor. 12 13 THE COURT: Okay. 14 MR. MILLER: I very much appreciate it. 15 THE COURT: Well, give my law clerk then the caption 16 of the case and the New Jersey number. And we'll contact the 17 judge and ask him to do that. 18 What stage is that in? 19 MR. MOLDOVKY: We just -- we're waiting -- we just 20 filed a suit and served. We haven't even gotten the first 21 filing --22 THE COURT: Okay. 23 MR. MOLDOVKY: -- answer or motion. It's that early. 24 THE COURT: Okay. 25 MR. MILLER: I can give the docket number in a

second. I have it up here.

MR. MOLDOVKY: We can give it to the law clerk afterwards.

THE COURT: Okay. So, to make a long story short, we're going to stay the proceedings here. Nobody needs to do anything more until further order of the Court.

We will, pursuant to Rule 53, appoint Thomas Rueter. And I cannot appoint him till I talk to him, but assuming that he'd be willing to undertake this -- I have not discussed this at all with him, maybe I should have, I will appoint Thomas Rueter.

So, to serve as a Special Master with authority to both assist the parties in settlement of the case and/or rule on all discovery motions that are currently pending before the Court and to appropriately report to the Court thereafter.

And I'll have an order spelling out his authority, et cetera, fees to be apportioned by the Special Master at the conclusion of the litigation.

I'm not sure, speaking of fees, I think what may happen, which I think JAMS you pay ahead of time some amount, but I think at the conclusion, he can then apportion what that amount may be.

So, if one party of course is the culprit, that could be part of the resolution, how the fees are going to split.

So, that'd be a way to do it as well.

1	So, I'm pleased that both of you seem to be of the
2	mind to at least taste the wine here. And we would be at
3	the meantime, is there something else we can do, we will do
4	that, but I think this is a necessary step in either litigation
5	or resolution of all these claims.
6	Okay, anything else?
7	MR. MILLER: No, thank you, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Okay.
9	MR. MILLER: Thank you for your wisdom here, Your
10	Honor.
11	THE COURT: Very good. Okay, we're adjourned. Thank
12	you both.
13	MR. POMERANTZ: Thank you, Your Honor.
14	(Proceedings concluded at 10:32 a.m.)
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	